

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed July 28, 2005. In the Office Action, claims 98-115 were allowed. Claims 89-92 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 and claims 70-76 and 78-97 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Claims 78 and 93-97 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 117-121 have been added, where claim 117 is partially based on allowed claim 98. Reconsideration in light of the amendments and remarks made herein is respectfully requested.

Drawings

At paragraph one of the Office Action, the drawings were objected based on minor drafting informalities. Applicants respectfully submit that these drawing informalities have already been addressed in the prior replacement figures (FIGs. 8 and 11). Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the outstanding objection to the drawings.

Claim Objections

Claim 78 was objected based on an improper dependency. Since claim 78 has been cancelled without prejudice, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 89-92 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being allegedly indefinite. Applicants have amended claim 89 to remove the antecedent basis problem and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 89-92 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph based on the amendments set forth above.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 70-76 and 78-97 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Emer (U.S. Patent No. 6,493,741). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because a *prima facie* case of anticipation cannot be established for the pending claims.

As the Examiner is aware, to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is

found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Vergegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the...claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ 2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

For instance, with respect to independent claim 70, it is alleged that a “control unit” inside a system taught by Emer teaches the suspend logic as claimed. More specifically, the Office Action states “suspend logic (certainly inside the Emer et al. ‘741’s system, such as a control unit, see Fig. 2)...to set a monitor address” is taught by Emer. *See page 4, paragraph 5 of the Office Action.* Applicants respectfully disagree.

First and foremost, in contrast with these allegations, there is no description of a “control unit” within the Emer system. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to identify the component that alleging constitutes the “suspend logic” as claimed. This “suspend logic” must also suspend the first thread in response to a second instruction of the first thread. Withdrawal of the §102(e) rejection as applied to independent claim 70 is respectfully requested.

In addition, based on the dependency of claims 71-92 on independent claim 70, believed by Applicants to be in condition for allowance, no further discussion as to the grounds for traverse is warranted. Applicants reserve the right to present such arguments in an Appeal is warranted. However, for clarity purposes, arguments directed to the allowability of some of these dependent claims are provided.

For dependent claim 71, the Office Action alleges that the mapper (361) of Emer constitutes the translation look-aside buffer as claimed. *See Page 8 of the Office Action.* Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, and respectfully submit that Emer fails to provide any teaching that the monitor (event monitor 109) causes resumption of the first thread *in response to events that cause by the translation look-aside buffer (mapper 361 of Emer) to be flushed.* Hence, withdrawal of the §102(e) rejection as applied to dependent claim 71 is respectfully requested.

For dependent claim 73, the Office Action alleges that the limitations set forth in this claim are taught because a write will eventually cause an interrupt for the I/O operation. *See Page 9 of the Office Action.* Applicants respectfully disagree that Emer provides such teachings because there is no teaching of the event monitor (109) *causing resumption of the first thread in response to an interrupt* (e.g., NMI or SMI). *Emphasis added; See Page 9 of the Office Action.* Hence, withdrawal of the §102(e) rejection as applied to dependent claim 73 is respectfully requested.

For dependent claim 79, the Office Action alleges that the Emer discloses an instruction buffer which can be combined to form a single partition dedicated to one thread or can be partitioned to be used by a plurality of threads. *See Page 10 of the Office Action; Column 6, lines 35-59 of Emer.* Applicants respectfully disagree with the allegation because Emer is exclusively directed to a multi-threaded environment and does not account for a single threaded department. *See Column 6, lines 31-49 of Emer.* Hence, withdrawal of the §102(e) rejection as applied to claim 79 is respectfully requested.

For dependent claim 80, the Office Action alleges that the Emer discloses a front end (considered to be the fetch thread chooser 301 or map thread chooser 351 of Emer). *See Page 10 of the Office Action.* As claimed, the front end performs micro-operation (uOP) generation from macroinstructions. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because Emer does not disclose that the fetch thread chooser (301) or the map thread chooser (351) elements with such functionality.

In fact, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed functionality would not be performed by the fetch thread chooser (301) or the map thread chooser (351), and thus, respectfully request the Examiner to provide disclosure in Emer that supports the rejection. Otherwise, withdrawal of the §102(e) rejection as applied to claim 80 is respectfully requested.

For dependent claim 82, the Office Action alleges that the Emer discloses a processor wherein the second operand (in the “LDQ ARM R1, (R5)” instruction specifies events to mask. *See Page 11 of the Office Action; Column 6, lines 56 of Emer.* Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because the “LDQ ARM R1, (R5)” instruction is adapted to compute the lock’s

physical address from the contents of register R5, record the physical address in the event identification register (103), and load the lock value from the physical address into register R1. *See col. 6, lines 61-67 of Emer.* The second operand “(R5)” does not specify the events to mask as alleged in the Office Action. Withdrawal of the §102(e) rejection as applied to claim 82 is respectfully requested.

With respect to independent claim 93, the Office Action states that the *execution resources* (TPUs of Emer) execute the first instruction (LDQ ARM R1, (R5)) and the second instruction (QUIESCE) and to enter a first implementation dependent state (“armed” watch flag 105) *in response to the second instruction if the first instruction has been executed and no break events. Emphasis added; See Pages 6-7 of the Office Action.* Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection but further discussion may be moot based on the cancellation of claims 93-97 without prejudice. Withdrawal of the outstanding §102(e) rejection is respectfully requested..

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: June 26, 2006

By


William W. Schaal

Reg. No. 39,018

Tel.: (714) 557-3800 (Pacific Coast)

12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION (37 CFR 1.84)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being:

MAILING

FACSIMILE

☒ deposited with the United States Postal Service
as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:
Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450,
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

☐ transmitted by facsimile to the Patent and
Trademark Office.

Date: 06/26/2006


Susan McFarlane

06/26/2006

Date